

REMARKSGeneral Remarks

In the current Office Action, claims 1-68 and 70-72 were examined. Claims 1-68 and 70-72 were rejected.

Specifically, the current Office Action reads as follows:

Claims 1-68 and 70-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and/or under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Aharoni et al. (US 6,014,694), hereinafter 'Aharoni', and/or unpatentable over Aharoni in view of".

Claims 1-64, 67, 68, and 70-72 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Aharoni in view of Lane et al. (US 5,729,649), hereinafter 'Lane'.

Claims 65 and 66 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Aharoni in view of Wu et al. (ON End-to-End Architecture for Transporting MPEG-4 Video Over the Internet', hereinafter 'Wu'.

In this Reply, no claims are canceled or added. Hence, claims 1-68 and 70-72 continue to be pending.

Of pending claims 1-68 and 70-72, claims 1, 24, 47, 65, 68, and 72 are independent.

Independent claims 1, 24, 47, 65, 68, and 72 are amended by this Reply.

1
2 Substance of the Interview
3

4 An Applicant-Initiated Examiner Interview was conducted on April 15, 2005.
5 Applicants and Applicants' representative thank the Examiner for the gracious
6 opportunity to discuss the instant Application telephonically.
7

8 Much of the Substance of the Interview was made of record by the Applicant
9 in the PTOL-413A. The post-Interview portions are addressed below.
10

11 However, the positions of the Office as expressed at least in the final Office
12 Action (dated 09/10/2004) and the Interview Summary (form PTOL-413B) are
13 respectfully traversed. For example, it is respectfully submitted that the Aharoni et
14 al. document does not inherently or otherwise describe including prioritization
15 indications within transmitted media data.

16 Nevertheless, to facilitate prosecution of the instant Application and to
17 expedite its ultimate issuance as a U.S. Patent, the claims have been amended by this
18 current Reply as explicitly set forth above and as also discussed below.
19

20 In the Interview, Applicant's representative respectfully submitted that all of
21 the intelligent decisions with regard to what information is delivered to clients are
22 performed at the server side of Aharoni et al. Accordingly, no network component is
23 responsive to requests or input from a client device, especially in conjunction with
24 the consideration of prioritization indications included in media data that is in transit.
25

1 The Examiner indicated that these elements had not yet been fully searched
2 and/or examined as of the date of the Interview.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 Arguments

3
4 No art of record, including Aharoni et al., Lane, and/or Wu, either alone or in
5 any combination, anticipates or renders obvious the transmission of media data in a
6 bit stream along with indications of the prioritization of different portions of the
7 media data.

8 Additionally, no art of record, including Aharoni et al., Lane, and/or Wu,
9 either alone or in any combination, anticipates or renders obvious the discarding of
10 media data information based on input/requests from client devices.

11 Accordingly, no art of record, either alone or in any combination, anticipates
12 or renders obvious at least the following elements in conjunction with the other
13 elements of their respective claims:

14 Claim 1: selectively discarding, within the network that is configured to
15 provide differential services, one or more of the portions of the
16 object-based media information based at least on the associated
17 plurality of different transmission priority levels and on at least
18 one input received from a downstream client.

19 Claim 24: at least one communication network operatively coupled
20 between the server device and the client device, the
21 communication network being configured to provide selective
22 differential services based at least on the identifications of the
23 associated plurality of different transmission priority levels of the
24 portions of the object-based media information and on at least one
25 input received from the at least one client device.

1 Claim 47: selectively outputting from the communications node the
2 portions of the object-based media information based at least on
3 the indications of the different transmission priority levels
4 included in the received data and on at least one input received
5 from a downstream client with regard to the object-based media
6 information.

7 Claim 65: at least one video transmission agent (VTA) that is part of a
8 network linking the at least one client device to the at least one
9 server device, the VTA coupled to receive the prioritized object-
10 based data packets from the server device and the control requests
11 from the client device, the VTA adapted to selectively output at
12 least a portion of the received prioritized object-based data
13 packets to the client device based on the prioritization and in
14 response to the control requests.

15 Claim 68: a third field comprising a network packet header and
16 containing data identifying the specific transmission priority level
17 of the data in the at least one second field . . . wherein a network
18 node is enabled to selectively filter packets based on the specific
19 transmission priority level identified in the third field and
20 responsive to control requests from at least one downstream client
21 that is receiving the video object.

22 Claim 72: selectively discarding, within the network that is configured to
23 provide differential services, one or more of the portions of the
24 object-based media information based at least on the plurality of
25

1 different transmission priority levels and on at least one input
2 received from a downstream client.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 Dependent Claims

3
4 Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 24, 47, 65, 68, and 72
5 have been provided above. Claims 2-23/70, 25-46, 48-64/71, and 66-67 depend
6 directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 24, 47, and 65, respectively.
7 Although each also includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability,
8 these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given above in
9 connection with their respective independent claims.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of pending claims 1-68 and 70-72 are allowable, and prompt action to that end is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 8/31/2005

By: Keith W. Saunders
Keith W. Saunders
Reg. No. 41,462
(509) 324-9256 ext. 238